

REPORT
OF
THE PUBLIC SERVICES
(QUALIFICATIONS FOR RECRUITMENT)
COMMITTEE



MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

1956

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	1
The Problem	2
The Problem Analysed	4
Recommendations	6
General Recommendations	14
Minute of Dissent	21
Appendix I	24
Appendix I-A	26
Appendix II	28
Appendix III	31
Appendix IV	34



REPORT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICES (QUALIFICATIONS FOR RECRUITMENT) COMMITTEE.

I—INTRODUCTION

In April 1955, the Ministry of Education decided to set up a Committee to examine the need for a university degree as a pre-requisite qualification for the public services. The terms of reference of this Committee were finalised in September 1955 and published in the Education Ministry's Resolution No. F 23-49/54.A-I, dated the 16th April, 1955 that has been reproduced in Appendix I.

2 The Committee, known as the Public Services (Qualifications for Recruitment) Committee, held certain preliminary sittings in Delhi on the 18th and 19th of April to draft the Questionnaire. A copy of the Questionnaire finally adopted by the Committee will be found in Appendix II. Further meetings of the Committee to draw up the programme of work, were held in July and August. It was decided that the Questionnaire should be issued to all Ministries of the Government of India, the Union Public Service Commission, all State Governments, all State Public Service Commissions, all Universities and certain Federations and Associations of Chambers of Commerce. A list of authorities and organisations to which the Questionnaire was addressed has been reproduced in Appendix III of this Report. Besides circulating the Questionnaire, the Committee decided to issue a Press Note explaining the object with which the Committee was appointed and the task entrusted to it. Members of the public and other organisations who had not been specifically addressed were invited to contact the Member-Secretary of the Committee and obtain copies of the Questionnaires if they were interested in the matter under discussion. The views expressed by such individuals and organisations, the Committee made it clear, would be most welcome.

As regards the method of work, the Committee decided not only to consider carefully the written replies received in response to the Questionnaire, but also to examine orally the representatives of the organisations who had communicated their views. For this purpose, it was decided that the Committee should hold some sittings in Madras, Bombay and Calcutta in addition to meeting at Delhi. In accordance with this programme, the Committee visited Madras in September 1955, Bombay in November and Calcutta in December 1955. At each of the centres the meetings were held for about a week and representatives examined not only from these States but also from the neighbouring areas.

However, before the Committee could begin its work, it sustained a heavy loss in the sudden death of one of its distinguished members, Dr. Amarnath Jha. His death deprived the Committee of a valued colleague whose wide experience and deep scholarship would have been of invaluable help. Before the Committee commenced its work in Madras, the Chairman made a reference to Dr. Jha's demise and the Committee adopted a resolution of condolence.

II—THE PROBLEM

It is necessary in the first instance to describe briefly the problem as it appeared to the members of the Committee and for which they were expected to find a solution. In India the practice has developed over a long period for a university degree to be regarded, except in some technical and professional lines, as the minimum qualification for all but the lowest posts and services under the Government. The reason for this tendency can perhaps be found in our history of the recent past. The higher services under the Government, except during the last few decades of British Rule, were practically reserved for Europeans. The only outlet for educated Indians, therefore, lay in the subordinate posts and services under the Government. As University education spread in India and the number of graduates multiplied, there was naturally keen competition among them for these subordinate posts. With a large number of graduates applying for these posts, it was natural for the employers to restrict their selection to graduates. A graduate could be had comparatively cheap. There was, therefore, no reason for going below that level. Another reason for the almost universal preference for graduates lay in the fact that for Government service a fairly high degree of competence in the English language was necessary. Such competence could be expected only from persons who had gone through the university stage of education. It was natural from this point of view also that graduates should be preferred to persons who had not completed their university education. The result was that all commercial and industrial concerns as well as private employers came to look upon a degree as an almost indispensable condition for employment except at the lowest levels. It may, however, be admitted that in recent years some of these employers have tended to minimise the importance of a degree for employment at lower levels.

Conversely, this preference for graduates has been largely responsible for the increasing demand for university education. Persons with ambition to enter Government service find the doors closed, except for certain subordinate appointments or purely technical and professional ones, unless they are graduates. Many students take

to university education at great economic sacrifice and when a degree does not result in their obtaining employment under the Government, there is a sense of keen frustration. This association of a university degree with the higher and middle levels of Government service is an important factor in creating a psychological feeling of social respectability for graduates. Apart from the economic aspect of the matter, a non-graduate, however good he may be in his own work, suffers from a sense of social disadvantage. These factors have combined to create a craving for a university degree far beyond the real social, educational or cultural value of these degrees. It has, therefore, given rise to the problem of numbers and overcrowding in our universities.

With the type of economic development envisaged in the country, it is inevitable that a larger proportion from all sections of the community will be drawn into the educational stream and there will be an increasing number of students at all levels. Their improved economic position has in the present context given rise to the social ambition of obtaining a university degree and seeking employment at the higher levels of Government service. This yearning for education in all sections of the community is a development very much to be welcomed, but if the university degree is to retain the educational and cultural content that it should have, it is necessary to ensure that nothing is done to lower its value. The artificial value attached to a university degree for Government service and the consequent social value that it has acquired, has resulted in much larger numbers seeking admission to universities than the universities and colleges are equipped to educate. Nor is it merely a question of numbers. If that had been so, the obvious solution would have been to have more colleges or universities and to equip them to deal with larger numbers. In the rush for university education, quality has suffered. Persons who have neither the aptitude nor the inclination to pursue higher education seriously seek admission to these universities in larger numbers than ever before. In view of the keenness for university education that is displayed by the would-be entrants, the universities find it extremely difficult to refuse admission on a large scale. The result is that the great bulk of unsuitable persons has to be admitted. Where universities and colleges are not fully equipped to deal with such numbers the standard of higher education has naturally suffered. The contact between the teacher and the student is often restricted to classroom lectures without any tutorial or extra-mural guidance. It is difficult at present to ensure that the undergraduate benefits by the general cultural atmosphere of a university.

The greater the social and economic importance that is attached

to university degrees, the larger is the number that seeks university education, and the larger the number, the lower the standard of degree tends to become in the existing circumstances. This vicious circle has to be broken at some point if university education is to be restored to the position that it should really occupy. We expect that with economic development larger numbers will seek higher education. It is necessary, however, that university education should be utilised by persons who intend to pursue higher studies seriously. There is no need for those who are of a different bent of mind or who do not reach this standard to feel that they are socially ostracised. In a developing economy such persons have a very useful, and in fact, honourable role to play. A university degree as a requirement for the public services should continue to have its appropriate place, but it need not be a necessary qualification for all levels of service. If the Government can reconsider this matter, it may be expected that business and commercial firms would also be inclined to re-examine their own requirements. If, as a result of this reconsideration, a university degree is given its appropriate but not exaggerated, position in relation to employment prospects, both under the Government and in the private sector of business and industry, sufficient room will be left for non-graduates. The latter will not find the doors to higher appointments barred to them. This will introduce the correct perspective, and higher education will be sought by persons who value education mainly for its own sake and who can profit by such education

III—THE PROBLEM ANALYSED

The problem as stated above, has to be considered against the background of the scheme for reorganisation of Secondary education which, it is expected, will be introduced before long. As is perhaps generally known, this scheme of reorganisation proposes not only to prolong the period of pre-university education but to introduce an integrated course of Secondary education up to the age of 17 that will include a knowledge of the fundamentals of sciences and humanities. When this scheme is enforced, Secondary education, it is expected, will differ in content from what it is today. Only persons who have successfully gone through the longer and better integrated course of Secondary education and have attained that degree of maturity that comes with a higher age level, will go in for higher education at universities. The Secondary education stage by itself will represent a degree of intellectual and cultural development which the products of the High schools today do not attain. The question as to whether a

university degree or a School Final Certificate should be considered sufficient for the various levels of Government service should be viewed against this background. The fact that the Matriculation or a School Final Certificate as it exists today, is not considered sufficient for certain levels of Government service, does not necessarily mean that persons who successfully pass the reorganised course of Secondary education should also be considered unsuitable for those levels for similar reasons. This is a factor which we have kept in view in framing our recommendations. We appreciate, however, that there may be a time-lag before the re-organised Secondary education comes into force. For that interim period certain temporary arrangements may have to be made. Our recommendations are however intended, except where the contrary is stated specifically, for the long term.

In considering the need for university degrees for the public services, an important factor to be kept in view is whether the lowering of academic requirements should not be accompanied by special arrangements for the training of new recruits to render them suitable for the posts and services for which they are recruited. Even conceding that a university degree does not in the present context represent the standard of intellectual or cultural attainment that it should do, there is no doubt that it does represent a higher standard of attainment than may be expected from persons who do not hold such degrees. To recruit non-graduates to the services, therefore, may mean a certain lowering of the standard, and the question that arises is whether this should not be made up by a course of training, professional or general, which would render the entrants to the new services fit for the jobs that they are called upon to perform. We have considered this aspect of the problem carefully and have come to certain conclusions which are recorded in the next section.

Another aspect of the problem to which attention has been specifically drawn in our terms of reference is the method or methods to be adopted for the selection of personnel in the absence of a university degree. The requirement of a university degree limits the field of choice for recruits to the public services. The tests for recruitment which are applied thereafter are restricted to the field so limited. With a wider field of choice, however, the need for more stringent tests would arise. It is necessary in this connection to reiterate the fundamental principles of selection to the public services on the basis of which the methods of recruitment must be framed. It is not sufficient for these methods to ensure that the person selected can do his work adequately. From the point of view of the taxpayer the State is entitled to the services not merely of the person who can discharge his duties

satisfactorily, but the person who is the best available for the remuneration offered. It is also an important principle that in selection to the public services the methods employed should be such as not only to ensure complete objectivity, but also to avoid any suggestion or allegation of favouritism or bias. The scope for unsatisfactory selection or for the exercise of influence of any type was hitherto restricted to some extent by the requirement of a degree qualification. If a university degree as a minimum qualification is not insisted upon, at least for certain levels of Government service, it is all the more necessary to ensure that the principles of selection mentioned above are adequately provided for by the methods of recruitment actually adopted.

Finally, the terms of reference have drawn our attention to the practical problem of numbers which the lowering of academic qualifications must necessarily involve. At present insistence on a degree restricts numbers. If this condition is waived, it is only to be expected that much larger numbers will apply for every post or service. Apart from the fact that some of these applications may even be frivolous in nature and involve a waste of public time and money for their consideration, the problem also arises of applying a uniform standard of selection to a very large number of candidates. The authorities concerned with public examinations are aware that it is difficult to introduce uniformity into the standard of examination unless all candidates are examined by the same individual or group of individuals. Large numbers of candidates, if they are subjected to written examinations, would naturally have to be examined by more than one individual, or a group of individuals, even with regard to the same written paper. The problem of coordination of standards of different examiners sets a problem which can only be solved satisfactorily either by limiting the number of applicants or by devising an examination where small deviations would not be of great consequence. In considering the question of lowering academic requirements for public services, the problem of numbers presents a practical difficulty which must be faced and to the extent possible, solved.

IV—RECOMMENDATIONS

In course of the evidence adduced before us and in the discussions which we have had with representatives of the various authorities and organisations, three points of view have broadly emerged. Of these, two may be regarded as belonging to two extremes. The first point of view is that the standard of university education having deteriorated in recent years, a university degree does not represent that standard of academic attainment that was associated with it earlier. This being so it is argued, a university degree is not really

a very high standard to set for even the middle levels of Government service. A person who does not acquire a university degree even in the present circumstances when such degrees are comparatively easy to acquire is obviously of a lower standard still in educational and cultural attainment. It would be in the interests of efficiency to recruit such persons to the public services. It is argued by the protagonists of this view that in practical administration the Government must be realistic enough to recognise the standards that obtain at present at various levels of education. To ignore such standards and to recruit non-graduates to various levels of Government service merely because non-graduates are recruited to corresponding levels in other countries would be highly unrealistic.

The other extreme view on the contrary maintains that competence and even academic attainment cannot be measured by certificates and degrees given by universities. No such qualification should be prescribed at all. Recruitment to the public services should be on the basis of competitive examinations. The standard of such examinations may be as high as is considered necessary for the level to which recruitment is made. Success in such examinations would by itself carry sufficient assurance of the intellectual qualities of the candidate, and would render unnecessary such artificial standards as School Final Certificate or a university degree. It is argued by the supporters of this view that it is quite possible for a person to attain a high intellectual standard without going anywhere near a university. In fact, lack of economic resources and other reasons might prevent bright young persons from studying at a university, and yet they may have by private study attained the same intellectual standard as, if not even higher than, those who have obtained their B.A. or M.A. degrees. There is no reason why such persons should be kept out of the public services.

Between these two extreme views, a large number of witnesses who appeared before us expressed the view that while university degree should continue to be the minimum qualification for the higher levels of Government service, it need not be insisted upon for levels which are not so high. While agreeing on this broad generalisation, there were naturally differences of opinion even among such witnesses as to the level at which the line should be drawn. Some witnesses felt that the present requirements were by and large fair, and that only some slight modifications need be made. Others, however, were of the opinion that the level of public services at which non-graduates could be admitted, could be raised considerably above what it is today.

We have given careful consideration to all three points of view. We are unable to agree with the first view because it not only holds out no solution of the problem which has arisen but in fact,

perpetuates the vicious circle, to which we have already referred. The result of the indiscriminate insistence on university degrees has been to create a rush for university education even among people who can neither afford such education economically, nor are likely to profit by it intellectually. There are numerous instances where families have been hard put to finance the university education of their children only to discover after a number of years that either—

- (a) the persons in question have not the aptitude to pass the course successfully; or
- (b) even if they do pass and ultimately obtain the long cherished degree, it does not help them to find the type of employment they desire.

Naturally there is disillusionment which is all the more bitter as it follows a comparatively long period of economic hardship and misery. In these circumstances, it would be a counsel of despair to suggest that the vicious circle cannot be broken at any stage. The circle must be broken and can be done either—

- (a) by refusing admission to universities to persons who do not attain a certain standard in the Secondary schools; or
- (b) by removing the inducements which make persons go in for university education even when they have no special taste for it.

It can certainly be argued by the protagonists of the view under discussion that the first alternative is the only right course. The universities, it may be contended, should strictly limit admission on the basis of candidates' performance in schools. While undoubtedly there is some scope for action in this respect, it would be highly unrealistic to suppose that in the face of a strong public desire to obtain admission to universities it would be possible for the latter to refuse admission to any considerable proportion of the intending entrants. By refusing such admission universities would not only lay themselves open to the charge of denying higher education to a proportion of the population but also of practically denying them decent employment thereafter, as no such employment would be available except to university graduates. In any case, the second alternative should be immediately pursued. University education must be placed in its proper perspective in relation to employment opportunities, and the desire to obtain some sort of a degree only to get employment thereafter discouraged.

It has been urged that there is no positive evidence to support the view that the rush for university education arises out of a desire for employment, or, to put it in a different form, that the elimination of the degree requirement for public services would to any appreciable extent reduce this rush. In a matter like this it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to collect evidence which would establish

causal relationship between the two phenomena, namely, the rush for university education on the one hand, and the desire for employment on the other. In fact, it would be simplifying matters unduly if the desire for employment were regarded as the only reason for the congestion at universities. There are certainly other reasons, not the least of which is the absence of employment opportunities at the pre-university stage. The fact that there is unemployment on a large scale among the middle classes is certainly one of the reasons why in the absence of any better occupation, both parents and students find the continuance of education the only useful occupation. From our experience, and this was corroborated by those of the witnesses who appeared before us, it is not difficult to conclude that many students enter universities merely because at this stage they have nothing better to do. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the hope of improving their prospects of getting employment is an important factor which induces many students to enter universities. To the extent that this statement can be proved by statistical data, the figures in Appendix IV are of interest. These figures show the number of graduates from the Indian universities during 1953-54 for which we have been able to obtain information, and the number of candidates who appeared at the recruitment examinations of the U.P.S.C. during 1954-55. The latter figure in particular is incomplete, for large numbers of candidates appear at examinations held by recruiting authorities other than the U.P.S.C., mainly those held by the State Public Service Commissions. Recruitment is also effected on an *ad hoc* basis, direct by the Commissions or other Government agencies. The number of graduates who apply for such *ad hoc* recruitments is not inconsiderable, but the figures are not available to this Committee.

These figures show that the desire for employment is at least an important consideration which induces students to take up university education. If such employment, or at least a proportion of it, could be made available to persons without university education, there will at least be one factor less contributing to overcrowding at universities. Besides, if a proportion of students could be drawn into the services at the end of their school careers, the number of persons who would continue with university education in the absence of better occupation would also be correspondingly reduced.

The second view referred to above, namely, that competence and academic attainment cannot be measured by university degrees, in the opinion of the Committee, goes to the other extreme. To dispense with academic qualifications altogether and to rely on competitive recruitment examinations in order to ensure maintenance of intellectual standards in public services would, in our opinion, be unwise. It is, of course, possible to point to stray cases in which persons have obtained high intellectual and cultural standards com-

pletely outside the universities. Instances can be cited of literary geniuses like Shakespeare and Rabindra Nath Tagore who have never had any university education. Genius has no law, but to base a scheme on such exceptions would be dangerous. The fact on the other hand remains that university education, apart from the intellectual standard that goes with it, does carry certain cultural values and a maturity of outlook. These values cannot be assessed by examinations, however, thorough. There is no system of examination so far conceived that can completely and correctly assess the total personality of an individual. Personality is a complex phenomenon and is built up through a variety of experiences, of which experience in a university is an important one. However poor the university standard may be, its contribution to the development of personality cannot be altogether ignored. Nor should university education be condemned because the present standard of such education in our country is not uniformly high. If the standard of university education is not as high in India as it should be, our efforts should be directed towards improving the standard. To condemn university education or to ignore it because we fail to improve the standard is at best a counsel of despair. We must presume, therefore, that the very fact, that a person has passed through a university and done the usual course, carries with it some assurance that he has developed a certain degree of personality. There is no means of judging with complete assurance to what extent this personality has been developed by those who have not had this experience.

A view has been put forward by some of our colleagues that university education should be dissociated from employment prospects. It has been argued that as long as these two are connected, university atmosphere will continue to be vitiated by the influx into the universities of persons whose main, if not only, objective is to obtain some advantage in the matter of employment. We appreciate the high idealism which inspires this view and which seeks to maintain the purity of academic education. We do not agree, however, that elimination of the degree qualification from public service requirements will lead to the objective which the advocates of this view have in mind. There is no doubt that at the highest levels of public services there is need for persons who have attained high intellectual and cultural standards. Organised opportunities for attainment of such standards exist at present only in the universities. The public services, therefore, have a definite need for persons trained in these universities. Employment in these spheres cannot, as a consequence, be divorced entirely from university education, nor would it be in the larger public interest to do so. Our colleagues who advocate this view under discussion would rely on a sufficiently searching recruitment examination for entry into the public services and would eliminate degree requirements. It is admitted by them, however,

that as long as a high standard of recruitment examination is maintained, very few persons without university training are likely to succeed in such competitive examinations. Those ambitious to enter at these levels would, therefore, continue to avail themselves of the training which university education has to offer, for they would realise that it is only by doing so that they would have any reasonable chance of fulfilling their ambitions. As long as this is so, a complete divorce between university education and employment prospects is not possible, and there is no way of ensuring that persons who go in for university education do so solely because of their love for such education.

On these grounds, we are of the opinion that university degrees cannot and should not be dispensed with entirely. There is no doubt, however, that there has been exaggerated emphasis on such degrees in our country for reasons which have already been stated. A re-examination of the requirements in relation to the different levels of Government services is, therefore, what is required. For this purpose we have broadly divided public services into three categories:—

- (a) Senior Officers—Executive and Administrative.
- (b) Junior Officers—Executive and Administrative.
- (c) Clerical Services.

The first category, namely, that of senior executive and administrative services, would include the All-India services as well as the Central and State Class I services where persons would be required to take important decisions and have intimate acquaintance with the policy-making activities of the Government. As an illustration, it may be stated that the services to which recruitment is now made on the results of the Combined Competitive Examinations held by the Union Public Service Commission for recruiting to the I.A.S., I.F.S., etc. and the services which are described as Class I Executive services in the State Governments would fall under this category. The third category would comprise the clerical or ministerial services where duties are of a routine nature. All the rest will come under the second category.

In classifying the services in these three categories we have excluded those of a technical and professional nature for which special considerations would apply. By technical services we mean those that require not merely specialised experience but qualifications or training of a technical nature. There is a tendency today for all services to be more and more specialised. This, however, only means that those services have to be manned by persons who have acquired some specialised experience of these branches of activity. They are not, strictly speaking, technical services. On the other hand, there

are services like engineering which require special training and qualifications. These are the services that can rightly be regarded as technical services. There are, besides, what may be termed professional services, such as services relating to law, medicine and teaching. These technical and professional services we have excluded from our purview.

In our opinion, a university degree should definitely not be insisted upon for the clerical services. We would in fact go a step further, and while we would not disqualify graduates from entering the clerical services, we would discourage them from doing so. This we feel, can best be done by fixing the age limits at suitable levels which would preclude graduates from entering this service. Against the background of the reorganised system of education to which we have referred, we would suggest that for clerical services the age limit should be 17—19. When the new system of education comes into force, it would not be possible for anyone to obtain a degree before the age of 20. To fix the maximum age limit at 19 would, therefore, preclude graduates from competing for such services.

This, we feel, will have a distinct advantage. Persons who are interested in services of this type would know as soon as they complete the Secondary school stage that they would have to compete for these services without going in for university course. In fact, those who do go in for university course will do so with the realisation that the clerical services would be closed to them. There will thus be no question of any disillusionment at the end of university career arising out of a graduate not being able to get even a clerical post.

It has, however, been pointed out to us that for certain types of employment it would not be appropriate to insist rigidly on the age limit 17—19 recommended by us. There are posts in certain departments which are grouped with the clerical services mainly because they carry the clerical rates of pay. They are lower executive in nature and in some cases carry a marked degree of responsibility, though not perhaps much of discretion. Such posts to which our attention has in particular been drawn are posts in the lower formations of the Revenue, Railway and Communication Departments. Normally, even in such cases it should be possible to recruit at the age level suggested by us and to give the recruits adequate training for a sufficiently long period to enable them to discharge their duties satisfactorily. This, however, naturally presumes that recruitment will be made in due anticipation of the requirements by the Departments concerned. In an expanding economy where the State has without sufficient notice to undertake new activities, such planned anticipation is not always possible. A new taxation introduced in a

new financial year may well require a large number of tax collectors for whom there is no time to be trained. In such emergent situations it would hardly be possible to entrust the responsibilities to persons of the age level contemplated by us. A higher level of maturity is obviously called for. We agree that in such circumstances, there would be a good ground for deviating from the general recommendation we have made.

We suggest that each such case should be considered on its merits, and slightly higher age levels introduced as and where found necessary.

For the middle category we are of the opinion that university degree should not be made the minimum qualification, but that graduates should be given an opportunity to compete, if they so desire. We, therefore, suggest that the age limits for this group of services should be 19—21. This would render services of this nature open to non-graduates as well as to graduates.

Finally, for the top-most grades we are definitely of the opinion that entry into these services should be restricted to graduates. This view is based on our opinion that for the highest Executive and Administrative services a maturity of outlook and cultural standard is required which by and large, can naturally be expected of graduates. For these services, therefore, we recommend the age level of 21 to 23.

It will be noted that for all levels of Government service we have recommended a span of two years as against the usual span of three years between the minimum and the maximum age limits. This recommendation has been made deliberately because we are of the opinion that the mental qualities as also the personality can best be tested in one or at the most two examinations. A person who fails to come up to 'the standard' in the first two examinations may, on the basis of his experience of the examinations and having acquired the technique thereof, be successful in the third. Such success, however, does not necessarily reflect the innate qualities of the candidate. We have also noted that under the present system of three examinations, the first examination is often taken by the candidates without that degree of seriousness that should normally go with such an effort. It is often taken only in order to acquire some experience of the technique of examinations. This leads to the number of candidates being unnecessarily multiplied, thus adding to the administrative problem of holding examinations. Two chances would obviate this disadvantage and to that extent, would be of benefit.

We have made no mention so far about the Scheduled Castes and other Backward Classes. We would like to point out that our recommendations are made on the basis that the concessions enjoyed by

the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other Backward Classes: are not in any way affected.

We would like to mention at this stage that our recommendation throwing open clerical as well as the middle level of Government services to non-graduates is based on the assumption that recruitment to these levels is on the basis of open competitive examinations. We are of the opinion that for these levels it is not necessary to insist on a high level of intellectual and cultural attainment. The standard expected of persons who have passed the School Final under the re-organised system is sufficient for these levels, but it is necessary to ensure that this standard is tested in an examination. Where such recruitment examinations are not held, it would be necessary to fall back, as at present, on university degrees which, in the absence of any other objective test, would guarantee at least a minimum standard of the qualities required for the posts. We recommend that as far as possible individual posts should be grouped together in organised services and competitive examination held for recruitment to such services, and that the age levels and the educational qualifications should be as suggested by us. Where, however, such examinations are not possible a higher standard of qualification should be maintained.

Interim Arrangements. Our recommendations, as already stated, have been conceived against the background of the proposed educational reorganisation. The period which lapses before the reorganised system is adopted should, we feel, be utilised in giving notice to the future recruits about the proposed changes for admission to the recruitment examinations. We recognise that a reasonable period of notice before the introduction of the new scheme is essential to avoid hardship. Persons who have embarked on a course of university education and have perhaps faced difficulties, financial and otherwise, in the hope of obtaining employment under the Government should not certainly find employment prospects disappear on account of a change in the recruitment policy. An interim period of notice is, therefore, essential for a transition to the new system and we recommend accordingly.

V—GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Recruitment Examinations. We have suggested that the degree qualification should be abolished for the lower and the middle levels of public services. We have, however, recommended that it should continue for the top levels. For all levels of Government service, however, we are of the opinion that recruitment examinations of adequate standard should be held for the selection of candidates. We would like to make the following observations regarding the nature of such examinations.

The examination should be of a comprehensive nature and should test the mental qualities rather than merely the memory or the fund of information of the candidates. Every paper in the examination for the higher services should be of the Honours standard and every candidate for such services should be required to take at least two subjects. The questions set at the examination should be so framed as to test the capacity of the candidates for rational thinking as well as their sense of values. The questions should deal with the significant phases of the subject and emphasise evaluation and rational thinking. They should compel the candidates to integrate their ideas and draw upon the entire background of their knowledge and also test the candidates' reaction to different circumstances. The questions should also test the mental alertness of the candidates and offer scope for originality of thought and expression.

In addition to these tests, there should also be some test for judging the personality, attitude and aptitude of candidates. Their past career may offer some insight into these and in addition, the first three months of the probationary period should be used for forming a correct idea about their personality. Obviously, unsuitable candidates may during these three months be weeded out by a properly constituted Board in consultation with the Public Service Commission. One way of ensuring that the candidates derive full benefit from their period of probation may be to evaluate their achievements during this period and add it to the competitive examination marks for determining their final ranking in the services.

Method of Promotion. A point of view has been expressed before us that lowering the academic standard for certain levels of Government service may be unobjectionable so far as work at those levels is concerned, but that it would have the disadvantage of not qualifying such persons for promotion to higher posts. It has been argued, for instance, that a non-graduate who is appointed as an Executive Officer under a State Government or to a Class II post at the Centre may function satisfactorily enough in these posts. In making such appointments, however, it would be wrong to confine our view to the particular posts or services to which such persons are appointed. It should be open to every individual in the public services to rise to the highest post available on the basis of his merit. Unless such prospects are available, frustration is bound to creep in, and this will reduce the value and efficiency of the service. A non-graduate, on the other hand, however good he may be for the post to which he is appointed is not likely, it is argued, to have the mental calibre necessary for rising to the highest post in the superior services. To that extent, their promotion will be limited and a feeling of frustration created.

We have considered this problem and we appreciate the validity

of the point raised. We have, on the other hand, had evidence to show that a graduate is not always superior in merit to a non-graduate. Several State Governments informed us that there have been numerous instances in which in written examination non-graduates have successfully beaten graduates who have competed with them. This is specially true where the written examination is conducted not on a purely academic basis but is limited to the work of the department in which it is held. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that absence of higher education may to some extent render persons unfit for promotion to higher posts. We have recommended that university education need not be insisted upon except for the higher levels of Government services. We appreciate that an influx of non-graduates at the lower levels which this recommendation envisages may render a review of promotion prospects necessary. We recommend that such reviews should be undertaken on the basis of actual experience. At the same time it is necessary to ensure that promotions are not denied to non-graduates merely because of certain prejudices against such persons. It is necessary that their merit should be decided in a purely objective manner. We, therefore, recommend that as far as possible promotion from grade to grade should be made on the basis of departmental examinations. We appreciate that for all levels of Government services and on all occasions this may not be possible. We do feel, however, that the system of departmental examinations should be utilised to a larger extent than it is at present, especially in established cadres. We, therefore, recommend that the Government should not only review promotion quotas at present fixed but also undertake re-examination of the methods of promotion, and, to the extent possible, institute departmental examinations particularly in respect of organised services.

Training. We have given careful attention to the question of training of recruits to the various levels of public services. The problem of training is an important one, and there are reasons to believe that one of the reasons for the difficulty in maintaining a high standard of efficiency in the public services lies in the fact that it has been difficult for the training course of recruits to keep pace with the very much increased rate of recruitment to the expanded services. The administrative problem of training which the expansion of services has created is not only highly important but a very complicated one. We appreciate, however, that it is beyond the terms of reference of this Committee to examine this general problem. Nevertheless, we have a special responsibility in this matter. We have recommended that persons should be recruited to the lowest and the middle levels at ages which are much below those prevailing at present. Our recommendations also envisage that at the lowest levels the recruits would all be non-graduates, and at the middle level a proportion of them would have no university education. The com-

parative immaturity which goes with lower age levels and the lack of university education in a large proportion of Government servants intensify the need for adequate training before such persons are called upon to discharge the duties for which they are recruited. We, therefore, consider it an essential part of our recommendations that a proper scheme of training for all levels of Government service should be accepted and implemented by the Governments both at the Centre and in the States. In this Report we can give only an outline of the training which we envisage as the basic minimum. Further details will obviously have to be worked out by the Governments themselves.

For the lower levels of Government service, particularly at the clerical level, training will obviously have to be decentralised. We contemplate training at this level to be given in the districts, preferably at one centre for a group of districts. The period of training should be at least one year and should consist not only of professional items such as typing, maintenance of files, noting, drafting etc., but also instruction in general subjects aimed at giving the recruits a general education to render them not only good clerks but useful citizens. For the higher levels of Government services a similar scheme should be adopted. In this connection a point of view which has been expressed before us is that at least for the highest level, like the All-India services, it would be useful to entrust the training to some selected universities. It has been argued that by doing so we shall help to break the barrier which exists at present between Government servants and the general public. While there is undoubtedly considerable force in this suggestion, we feel that the balance of advantage would lie in the Governments themselves organising courses of training with such help as may be necessary from the universities instead of seconding the probationers to a course of study at one of the universities. At the highest level we do envisage a university degree as the minimum qualification. All the recruits to these services, therefore, would have spent a number of years at a university and no useful purpose would therefore be served by sending them back to a university for a further period. On the other hand, there would certainly be considerable advantage in using the facilities which universities have to offer in order to impart instruction in subjects which are important for the training of the higher civil servants. Social subjects, particularly Economics, are of the highest importance in the present context in administration. To a lesser extent a knowledge of Law is essential for the Administrative services. Instruction in these subjects may well be arranged in cooperation with the universities. We, therefore, recommend that the courses of training should be arranged in consultation with and with the co-operation of the universities but under the auspices of the appropriate Government department.

We are also of the opinion that for the highest executive and administrative services a period of training abroad after they have seen different parts of India would be highly useful. This will not only help to broaden the outlook of the recruits generally but also help to develop in them an All-India outlook by enabling them to view our own country from outside and give them a more correct perspective of her needs and aspirations.

Limitation of numbers.—The terms of reference of this Committee have drawn our attention to the problem of numbers that would inevitably arise from any lowering of academic standards. There is no doubt that if non-graduates are allowed to compete for the various services, larger numbers would apply for these services than would have applied if applicants were limited to graduates. This increase in numbers may well create a serious administrative problem. Apart from the problem of arranging for the examination of large numbers of candidates, the question would arise of maintaining a uniform standard with respect to all those who appear at such an examination. It is well known that uniformity in the assessment of examination papers is difficult to maintain when the examination is conducted by a number of examiners who do not necessarily follow the same standard of assessment. The problem arises as soon as the number of examiners is more than one. But it can be kept under control so long as the number is reasonably small. With the increase in the number of examinees the number of examiners has to be increased proportionately and the problem of maintaining uniformity among a very large number of examiners throws up a problem of considerable complexity. To meet this problem of numbers, a suggestion has been made that a system of deposits should be insisted on from all examinees. This deposit should be refundable to candidates who secure the prescribed minimum percentage of marks but should be forfeited in the case of those who do not even attain this standard. The fear of forfeiture, it is hoped, will deter frivolous candidates who have no reasonable chance of successfully competing at the examination and will thus help to reduce the number of examinees. The suggestion is an attractive one but it has been opposed on behalf of several institutions and organisations on the ground that it would penalise the poor candidates more than the rich. The system of deposits would be no deterrent to the rich and the well-to-do even if they chose to be frivolous, but would impose a real hardship on those who are hard put to collect the money for deposit. We agree with this criticism and are unable to recommend a system which is obviously open to the criticism of being particularly hard on poorer candidates. As an alternative, we would suggest that where the number of

examinees is very large, a system of weeding out by preliminary examination may be adopted. The preliminary examination should be restricted to one or two simple written papers which would test the general alertness and mental calibre of the candidates concerned. As a result of this preliminary test a number of candidates equal to a given multiple of the number to be finally recruited should be selected for the final examination. It is true that the preliminary examination would be subject to the same defect of lack of uniformity as for any examination where large numbers appear. For a preliminary examination, however, lack of uniformity is not necessarily a serious disadvantage, provided deviations from the norm are not very great. As a result of this examination a much larger number would be selected for the final examination than there are vacancies for recruitment. So long as a liberal margin is allowed, it would not make any serious difference whether a few persons at the margin are or are not allowed to compete for the final examination, because the marginal candidates would not have a serious chance of being finally recruited.

A point which has been brought to our notice often in the course of our discussions is the lack of uniformity in the standards of the various universities all over the country. The same degree or diploma given by two different universities often involves two entirely different standards. A B.A. or a Ph.D. of one university is not necessarily of the same standard as a B.A. or a Ph.D. of another. This is a problem which we are informed has engaged the attention of the education authorities but has defied solution so far on the ground that there is no objective standard on the basis of which the degrees awarded by different universities could be measured. The problem is, however, important from the point of view of the recruitment policy of the Government. We have recommended that a degree should be made a pre-requisite qualification for the highest levels of Government service. This recommendation would be without significance if the degree did not at least approximately measure up to a certain standard of academic and cultural attainment. We appreciate, however, that the problem is complicated and a solution must be left to the authorities in charge of higher education in this country. We do feel, however, that recruiting authorities like the Public Service Commissions may help considerably in devising an objective standard for assessing the value of education given by the different universities and thus help the authorities concerned to introduce some uniformity in this respect. We recommend that the Public Service Commissions should publish annually tabulated results of the examination held by them, analysing the marks obtained by candidates from different universities in different sub-

jects. The results thus tabulated would speak for themselves and the long-term trends would clearly indicate the quality of the products of different universities in different subjects in which they are trained. Such materials would provide an objective basis on which the quality of the training imparted by different universities can be assessed.

(Sd.) Dr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, *Chairman.*

Members

(Sd.) Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar,

(Sd.) Dr. Sushila Nayak,*

(Sd.) Dr. J. C. Ghosh,

(Sd.) Prof. Humayun Kabir,*

(Sd.) Prof. N. K. Sidhanta,*

(Sd.) Shri A. K. Roy,

(Sd.) Shri K. P. Mushran,

(Sd.) Shri R. C. Dutt, *Member—Secretary.*

*Subject to the Minute of Dissent.



শাসক সভা

MINUTE OF DISSENT

We regret that we cannot agree with the majority of our colleagues who hold that admission to the competitive examination for recruitment to the highest services of the State should be restricted only to graduates of universities. Having listened to the evidence of competent people in various parts of India, we are definitely of the view that there is not sufficient justification for insisting that a university degree must be a pre-requisite qualification for entrance to any non-technical post under the Government.

We agree with the majority of our colleagues that the highest executive and administrative services require maturity of outlook, a high cultural standard and a wide background of knowledge. While the university is obviously the best place to acquire these qualities, there are cases on record where men and women have developed them in the hard school of life. Their number may not be large but there is no reason to exclude such persons from entering for the competitive examination for the highest services when their final selection for the service will depend on how they fare in the exacting and comprehensive examination to be conducted by a Public Service Commission.

It may further be pointed out that overcrowding at many of the universities in recent times has prevented them from discharging adequately their proper functions as centres for the dissemination of culture. It may also be added that under existing conditions, many persons acquire degrees as private candidates and do not therefore receive even the limited amenities which our colleges and universities offer. Even those who enter their names on the rolls of colleges and universities have at times only a nominal connection with their academic and cultural life. While measures for improving the universities have been taken in hand, there is no prospect of the situation being transformed in the immediate future. In fact, with the introduction of universal education at the Elementary stage and the resultant increase in the number of pupils at the Secondary stage, the likelihood is that conditions in the universities may suffer a further temporary deterioration.

One reason for the overcrowding in universities has been the insistence on a degree for all worthwhile appointments under the Government. Even if the degree qualification is waived for the two lower levels of services and a degree is insisted upon only for

the highest services, one of the main reasons for the present over-crowding will still remain. Young persons generally overrate their own abilities and consider themselves fit for the highest offices. Also, there is often a tendency to look on the present competitive examinations for services as something of a lottery. As such, many men and women without the requisite ability will be tempted to pursue higher studies in the university only in the hope that they might find a place in one of the higher services.

We share the anxiety of our colleagues that everything must be done to ensure that there is no lowering of the standard of the highest services. Some of our colleagues seem to apprehend that the abolition of a degree as a condition precedent to admission into the public services may lead to such deterioration. They point out that insistence on a degree means a double check on the quality of the candidates. The candidates now have to satisfy the Public Service Commission about their fitness and aptitude. Our colleagues seem to fear that elimination of the degree qualification may lay the Public Service Commissions open to political or public pressures resulting in a lowering of standards of the competitive examination.

We are not able to accept this majority view for two main reasons. The Public Service Commissions are independent and are constitutionally protected against interference by the Executive or the Legislature. Any lowering of standards in the public services examinations can therefore take place only if there are doubts about the integrity of the members of the Commission. If such doubts are once entertained, even the double check of a university degree and the public services examination would become meaningless. In fact, we are satisfied that the Public Service Commissions are in a position to maintain standards of integrity and fairness and to resist public pressure to a much higher degree than almost any other body.

It may also be added that if there are any apprehensions of political pressure on a Public Service Commission, such apprehensions would be much greater in the case of a university which is dependent on annual grants and is also amenable to agitation by students and members of the public. It is an unfortunate experience that as a result of such pressures, some universities have in recent years lowered standards and granted a larger number of first classes or higher degrees than would be warranted on strict merit. If the competitive examinations for public services are planned and conducted in a proper manner, it is certain that apprehensions about any lowering of standards in public services as a result of removing the degree qualification will prove unfounded. We however agree

with our colleagues that the degree qualification cannot be relaxed if any recruitment to the organised services is made without comprehensive and searching competitive examinations we have recommended in the body of the report.

(Sd.) Humayun Kabir,

(Sd.) Sushila Nayar,

(Sd.) N. K. Sidhanta.



APPENDIX I

No. F. 23-49/54.A.1,
 Government of India,
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

New Delhi-2, the 16th April, 1955

RESOLUTION

Subject:—Appointment of a Committee to consider the proposal that University degree need not be insisted upon as a condition for employment to Public Services.

The Government of India have for some time been considering whether it is necessary to prescribe, as is the case at present, that possession of university degree is a necessary qualification for appointment to all but some of the lowest posts and services under the Government. It is also necessary to re-examine the justification for such insistence in cases where recruitment is on the basis of competitive examinations. If there is no such justification, it has to be considered what other conditions, if any, should be devised to limit the number of candidates at such examinations. In order to consider these questions in all their aspects, the Government of India have appointed a Committee with the following as members:

Dr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar—*Chairman.*

Dr. C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar.

Dr. Amar Nath Jha.

Dr. J. C. Ghosh.

Dr. Sushila Nayar.

Shri N. K. Sidhanta.

Prof. Humayun Kabir.

Shri K. P. Mushran.

Shri A. K. Roy.

Shri R. C. Dutt, *Member—Secretary.*

The terms of reference of the Committee will be as follows:—

- (i) To examine the question as to how far and at what levels the possession of a university degree is necessary for recruitment to public services.
- (ii) To consider the type of tests which should be instituted to assess the relative merits of candidates in an objective manner in the absence of a university degree.

(iii) To consider measures to ensure that the numbers of candidates competing for posts and services under the Government are not wastefully large.

The Committee should submit its report to the Government of India on or before 31st August, 1955.

(Sd.) L. R. SETHI,
Deputy Secretary.

Copy forwarded to:—

Dr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, D-1, Clive Buildings, Calcutta.

Dr. C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar, Vice-Chancellor, Banaras Hindu University, Banaras.

Dr. Amar Nath Jha, Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.

Dr. J. C. Ghosh, Vice-Chancellor, Calcutta University, Calcutta.

Dr. Sushila Nayar, 16/90, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.

Shri N. K. Sidhanta, Member, Union Public Service Commission, New Delhi.

Professor Humayun Kabir, Secretary, Ministry of Education, New Delhi.

Shri K. P. Mushran, Member (Staff), Railway Board, New Delhi.

Shri A. K. Roy, Chairman, Central Board of Revenue, New Delhi.

Shri R. C. Dutt, I.C.S., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi.

ORDER

Ordered that this Resolution be communicated to all State Governments, the Chief Commissioner, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, the various Ministries of the Government of India, the Cabinet Secretariat, the Prime Minister's Secretariat, the Planning Commission, the Secretary to the President, the Comptroller and Auditor General, the Accountant General, Central Revenues, the Union Public Service Commission.

Ordered also that the Resolution be published in the Gazette of India for general information.

By Order,

(Sd.) T. S. Bhatia,
Under Secretary.

APPENDIX I-A.

No. F. 23-26/55.A-1,

Government of India,

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

New Delhi-2, the 17th September, 1955

RESOLUTION

Subject:—Appointment of a Committee to consider the proposal that University degree need not be insisted upon as a condition for employment to Public Services—Extension of time limit for submission of report by the Committee on or before 31st March, 1956.

In partial modification of para 3 of the Government of India, Ministry of Education Resolution No. 23-49/54-A.1, dated the 16th April, 1955, the Committee has been allowed to submit its report to the Government of India on or before 31st March, 1956.

(Sd.) Humayun Kabir,
Secretary..

Copy forwarded to:

Dr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, D-1, Clive Buildings, Calcutta.

Dr. C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar, Vice-Chancellor, Banaras Hindu University, Banaras.

Dr. J. C. Ghosh, Member, Planning Commission.

Dr. Sushila Nayar, 19, Rajpur Road, Delhi.

Shri N. K. Sidhanta, (Formerly Member, Union Public Service Commission) Vice-Chancellor, Calcutta University, Calcutta.

Professor Humayun Kabir, Secretary, Ministry of Education, New Delhi.

Shri K. P. Mushran, Member (Staff), Railway Board, New Delhi.

Shri A. K. Roy, Chairman, Central Board of Revenue, New Delhi.

Shri R. C. Dutt, I.C.S., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi.


ORDER

Ordered that this Resolution be communicated to all State Governments, the Chief Commissioner, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, the various Ministries of the Government of India, the Cabinet Secretariat, the Prime Minister's Secretariat, the Planning Commission, the Secretary to the President, the Comptroller and Auditor General, the Accountant General, Central Revenues, the Union Public Service Commission.

Ordered also that the Resolution be published in the Gazette of India for general information.

By Order,

(Sd.) A. K. Jain,
Under Secretary.



APPENDIX II

PUBLIC SERVICES (QUALIFICATIONS FOR RECRUITMENT)
COMMITTEE

QUESTIONNAIRE

I

I. (a) Service under the Central and State Governments and in public corporations

Please indicate, in the proforma attached, the services and posts for which University Degree is the prescribed minimum qualification.

(b) For industrial and commercial establishments only.

In industrial and commercial establishments what are the categories of posts and services, if any, for which University Degree is the prescribed minimum qualification? Please indicate approximately the annual intake into these services and posts and also to those for which University Degree is not required.

2. To what extent do University graduates apply for and are appointed to posts and services in preference to non-graduates even though University Degree is not prescribed for such posts and services as the minimum educational qualification? Could you indicate roughly the annual intake in respect of such posts (that is posts for which University Degree is not required) and the number of graduates appointed annually thereto?

II

3. Is it necessary in your opinion that University Degree should be prescribed for all services and posts for which they are prescribed at present? If not, indicate the categories of posts and services for which the degree requirement can be relaxed. What roughly would be the annual intake in respect of posts and services for which such relaxation can be made?

4. It has been suggested that if the same academic qualification is prescribed for higher as well as lower posts, persons holding the lower posts would tend to have a feeling of discontent and that discipline might be undermined to some extent. Do you agree with this view? Has any practical difficulty been experienced on this account?

5. It has also been suggested that because a University Degree is insisted upon in a large variety of posts, and even where it is not, graduates are, in fact, preferred, there is an undue rush for university education even among persons who have no real aptitude for, or interest in such education. It has been argued that this tends to lower the standard of university education on the one hand and involves, on the other, waste of manpower leading ultimately to a feeling of frustration. Do you agree with this view?

6. Has there been any difference between the performance of graduates and that of non-graduates in posts (e.g. ministerial posts) where the scope for discretion and judgment is limited?

7. (a) If non-graduates are recruited to a larger number of posts than at present, do you anticipate any difficulty about their promotion to higher grades on the ground that they lack high educational qualification?

(b) If you anticipate such difficulty, do you think it is a sufficient justification for not relaxing the present requirement of University Degree in respect of all posts for which they are prescribed at present.

III

8. If a University Degree is not considered necessary for some of the posts, would you take any steps to ensure that graduates do not in fact offer themselves for such posts? If so, what?

9. If the present educational qualification is relaxed for some posts, do you consider it necessary to take any special steps to ensure that reservations in favour of members of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and of any other class of persons for which Government may provide for similar reservations in terms of the Constitutional provisions on this subject are not affected by the new arrangement proposed?

10. The suggestion has been made that there should be three levels for purposes of initial recruitment and that the age limits for each of these levels should be as shown below:—

<i>Levels of recruitment</i>	<i>Age-limits</i>
(a) Clerical Services	17—19 years.
(b) Officers—Executive	19—21 ,,
(c) Senior Officers—Senior Executive and Administrative	21—24 ,,

What is your view on this proposal?

11. If candidates are recruited comparatively young, would you suggest that a course of training on a stipend should be given to them? What should be the nature and duration of such training?

12. Should the training centres for selected candidates be run solely by Government departments or should they be run by Government in cooperation with educational institutions?

13. To what extent will it be necessary to have better planning of the needs of Government services if this method of recruitment and training is accepted?

IV

14. In the absence of the requirements of a University Degree, what other objective methods would you suggest—

- (a) to limit the numbers of applicants for Government services; and
- (b) to ensure a minimum standard of educational attainment on the part of the candidates?

V

15. Have you any general observations to offer arising out of the preceding questions?

Proforma under Question I(a)

Statement showing the services and posts for which University Degree is the prescribed minimum qualification.

PART A—Organised Services

Names of Services	Nature of duties	Method of recruitment	Qualifications prescribed	Age-limits	Annual intake

PART B—Posts not included in organised services.

Designations of posts or classes of posts.	Nature of duties	Method of recruitment	Qualifications prescribed	Age-limits	Annual intake

APPENDIX III

LIST OF AUTHORITIES AND ORGANISATIONS TO WHICH THE QUESTIONNAIRE WAS ADDRESSED

*I—State Governments**Part 'A' States:—*

1. Government of Assam
2. Government of Andhra
3. Government of Bombay
4. Government of Bihar
5. Government of Madras
6. Government of Madhya Pradesh
7. Government of Orissa
8. Government of Punjab
9. Government of Uttar Pradesh
10. Government of West Bengal

Part 'B' States:

11. Government of Hyderabad
12. Government of Jammu & Kashmir
13. Government of Madhya Bharat
14. Government of Mysore
15. Government of Pepsu
16. Government of Rajasthan
17. Government of Saurashtra
18. Government of Travancore-Cochin

Part 'C' States:

19. Government of Ajmer
20. Government of Bhopal
21. Government of Coorg
22. Government of Delhi
23. Government of Himachal Pradesh
24. Government of Kutch
25. Government of Manipur
26. Government of Pondicherry
27. Government of Tripura
28. Government of Vindhya Pradesh

Part 'D' States:—

29. Government of Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

II—Universities

1. Agra University
2. Aligarh University
3. Allahabad University
4. Andhra University
5. Annamalai University
6. Banaras Hindu University
7. Baroda University
8. Bihar University
9. Bombay University
10. Calcutta University
11. Delhi University
12. Gauhati University
13. Gujarat University
14. Gurukula Kangri University
15. Gujarat Vidyapith
16. Hindustani Talimi Sangh
17. Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur
18. Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore
19. Jammu & Kashmir University
20. Jamia Millia Islamia University
21. Karnataka University
22. Kashi Vidyapith
23. Lucknow University
24. Madras University
25. Mysore University
26. Nagpur University
27. Osmania University
28. Patna University
29. Poona University
30. Punjab University
31. Rajputana University
32. Roorkee University
33. Saugor University
34. S. N. D. T. Women's University
35. Travancore University
36. Utkal University
37. Visva-Bharati University
38. Venkateswara University

*III—Public Service Commissions*

1. Andhra
2. Assam
3. Bihar
4. Bombay
5. Hyderabad

6. Madhya Pradesh
7. Madras
8. Madhya Bharat
9. Mysore
10. Orissa
11. Punjab
12. Pepsu
13. Rajasthan
14. Saurashtra
15. Travancore-Cochin
16. Uttar Pradesh
17. West Bengal
18. Union Public Service Commission

IV—Corporations

1. Corporation of Bombay
2. Corporation of Calcutta
3. Corporation of Madras

V—Federations, Associations, Chambers of Commerce etc.

1. Associated Chambers of Commerce and Industry, Calcutta
2. All India Manufacturer's Organisation, Bombay.
3. Ahmedabad Millowner's Association, Ahmedabad.
4. Bharat Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta.
5. Bombay Chamber of Commerce, Bombay.
6. Bengal National Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta.
7. Engineering Association of India, Calcutta.
8. Employer's Federation of India, New Delhi.
9. Federation of Indian Chamber of Commerce & Industry, New Delhi.
10. Gujarat Vepari Mahamandal, Ahmedabad.
11. Indian Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta.
12. Maharashtra Chamber of Commerce, Bombay.

VI—Associations & Federations of the Unions of Journalists

1. All India Newspaper Editors' Conference
2. Delhi Union of Journalists
3. Indian Journalists' Association
4. Indian Languages Newspapers Association
5. Indian Federation of Working Journalists
6. Southern Indian Journalists' Federation

VII—Chief Justices of

1. High Court of Bombay
2. High Court of Calcutta
3. High Court of Madras

APPENDIX—IV

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| I. Number of candidates who graduated in 1953-54 from recognised Indian Universities in Arts, Science or Commerce. | 50,600 |
| II. Number of candidates who appeared at the Combined Competitive Examination held by the Union Public Service Commission in 1954 for recruitment to the I.A.S., I.F.S. etc. | 4,471 |
| III. Number of candidates who appeared at the Assistant's Grade Examination held by the Union Public Service Commission in 1955. | 7,220 |






सत्यमेव जयते

ED144
2,500

PUBLICATION NO. 228



Price annas 7 or 8d.

PRINTED IN INDIA BY THE GENERAL MANAGER, GOVT. OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.
AND PUBLISHED BY THE MANAGER OF PUBLICATIONS, DELHI, 1956